



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ter on the prophet's call is also suggestive in its psychological analysis of the experiences of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. The method is illustrated by one sentence relative to Amos: "he said he must prophesy because God had spoken; in plain terms he means that *he perceived the condition of things* to which his Israelite neighbors were blind" (p. 80). The chapters on the relationship of the prophet to the state give a picturesque résumé of the political activities of the prophet. The closing chapters, on the prophet's relation to the church and on the prophet's vision, are somewhat one-sided and disappointing. The relationship to the church is considered mainly under the head of the prophetic opposition to the state church and the traditional cultus. It might have been well in this connection to dwell on the doctrine of the remnant and such passages as Isa. 8:11-18. The discussion of the prophet's vision is again almost wholly negative in character. It dwells on the limitations of the vision rather than on its content. Dr. Batten might claim that he is dealing with the prophet rather than with prophecy, with the man rather than with the message. Still, the figure of the prophet deserves to be studied, not only in the atmosphere of his everyday life, but also when wrapped in the splendor of his vision. At this point Dr. Beecher's work furnishes a needed supplement. Two things are symptomatic in their conjunction in Dr. Batten's book—the strongly religious, even homiletical, interest which everywhere pervades it (most helpfully in the discussion of the prophet's call), and at the same time its anti-miraculous bias (Dr. Batten would no doubt affirm emphatically his belief in the supernatural). This bias comes out in a somewhat unfortunate way in his attempts to rationalize some of the miracles; e. g., Elisha's ax (Elisha feels for the ax with a stick, p. 4), or his discovery of the Aramean ambuscades (by means of the sons of the prophets whom Elisha uses as scouts, p. 189), or the slaughter of the old prophet, I Kings, chap. 13, by a lion, i. e., a hired assassin (p. 278). Rationalizing legendary material is usually unprofitable business. But Dr. Batten's book, as a whole, gives an excellent portraiture of one of the most remarkable figures in the history of religion. KEMPER FULLERTON

OBERLIN, OHIO

---

**The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.** BY R. J. KNOWLING, D. D.  
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. Pp. 533. \$3.

This book contains the "Boyle Lectures" delivered by Dr. Knowling during the years 1903-5. The lectures are printed apparently without important changes, except that "many passages of length" are inserted, "as being more fitted for theological students." The tone and style of public discourse have been preserved.

Those who are acquainted with Dr. Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, published a dozen years ago, and his more recent *Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles*, will find in this new volume a careful restatement of much which is found in the earlier writings. The book is not, however, a mere repetition of information and arguments already given to the public. The author has carefully read the more recent literature upon the subjects discussed, and his point of view and method in these lectures give new interest to his statement of his convictions and the arguments and interpretations of Scripture which support them.

The author is a man of wide and careful reading, of minute and exact scholarship, and of definite and strong convictions, and yet with a manifest purpose to treat those who differ from him most radically with fairness and courtesy. He maintains what are known as conservative views of a somewhat extreme type; St. Paul is the author of all the epistles attributed to him; the epistles have been preserved in extant manuscripts without important changes; the Book of Acts was written by St. Luke, who is the author also of the "We-sections;" the Acts preserve the substance of St. Paul's discourses as he delivered them; St. Paul restored to life the lad Eutychus, who was surely dead, and performed other miracles attributed to him; and such statements of fact and doctrine as are found in Rom. 1:3, 4; 8:3; 9:5; Gal. 4:4, and elsewhere in the epistles are interpreted as supporting the doctrine of traditional orthodoxy. A reader who is not convinced of the soundness of some of the author's interpretations or arguments, and cannot accept all his conclusions, feels refreshed and strengthened to find that a man of so much learning and ability and candor, living in the present intellectual atmosphere, can maintain, with such unswerving conviction, the views which seem to many to be passing away like snow banks under vernal sunshine.

It must be admitted that the book has the fault of its virtue. It reveals the processes of an able and learned mind defending what is held to be the truth, rather than seeking for truth. It has the rhetorical tone of a book written in this spirit. The views of those from whom the author differs are fairly stated. But they are often referred to in a tone which does not indicate a judicial temper. Such phrases as these abound: "The latest phase—one is almost tempted to say craze—of modern criticism;" "It seems difficult to take such reasoning seriously;" "in reading, not without some impatience, these partition theories;" "very arbitrary and unfounded attacks;" "the ridiculous objection that Paul does not mention the empty tomb;" "a good instance of the way in which people who attack the Christian faith airily repeat the same objection;" "this alleged series of parallelisms is played out." When a writer from whom the author in

the main dissents, expresses a sentiment which he approves, he refers to it as "a frank acknowledgment," or "a remarkable acknowledgment," or as bearing testimony "however grudgingly." Such terms may be justly applied, but they reveal the spirit of the advocate rather than that of the scholar.

Under the same impulse the argument is sometimes pressed too far to be convincing. An example of this is found in the interpretation of Gal. 4:4 (pp. 45, 46, 262, 263). The author thinks that this verse at least suggests St. Paul's acquaintance with the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus. This view is supported by two arguments: (1) the Apostle writes *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*, instead of *γεννηθέντος ἐκ γυναικός*, and (2) St. Paul's "constant companion" wrote the first chapter of the third gospel; and, therefore, "it would be strange, to say the least of it, if this account, so well known to St. Luke, was unknown to St. Paul." But (1) *γίνομαι* is used in John 1:6, and 8:58, and often in the Septuagint and in classic Greek, of the ordinary beginning of a human life; (2) there is no evidence that St. Luke had written or read or heard the contents of the first two chapters of his gospel before the Epistle to the Galatians was written; (3) if St. Paul had meant to express the thought of Luke 1:26-35 he could hardly have written *ἐκ γυναικός* instead of *ἐκ παρθένου*, substituting for the word used in that section the word which often means a wife; (4) it is difficult to believe that St. Paul expressed in this blind way a wonderful and important fact which he never states in interpreting and enforcing his christological doctrine. But this is referred to simply to illustrate the method and spirit of the book. Such defects, if they are defects, spring from a very earnest desire to maintain very sincere convictions.

The deepest and most abiding impression made upon the minds of many who read this and similar books, not to gather arguments to support convictions already formed, but to gather and weigh evidence, must be surprise that the Apostle to the Gentiles made such meager use of events in Jesus' life and of his words, to enforce his doctrine and to inspire his readers to Christian faith and devotion. That he knew more than he put on record, as our author maintains, cannot be doubted; that he made freer use of gospel tradition in his preaching than he does in his letters, is a fair hypothesis, though not supported by any real evidence. Certain reasons for this comparative silence may be suggested, but they do not solve the riddle which the perusal of this interesting and valuable book brings freshly to mind. Why did not St. Paul make constant and effective use in his epistles of the wonderful life and the profound and suggestive teaching of his Lord? It would, however, be unjust to criticise this book for raising again this perplexing question to which no satisfactory answer has as yet been given.

WILLIAM H. RYDER

ANDOVER, MASS.